

THE
CHRISTIAN OBSERVATORY.

VOL. I.

OCTOBER, 1847.

No. 10.

POPERY AND THE UNITED STATES.

LET us compare the elements of Popery with the principles which lie at the foundation of our institutions.

In the first place, as a political system, popery is, and ever has been, the bitter foe of freedom. Despotism is a quality inherent in the very texture of the fabric. There is not, and never has been, upon the face of the earth, a papal community which has not been deprived of its rights, denied the full privilege of suffrage, and trodden in the dust, by the worst forms of tyranny. By the power of the confessional, that most formidable of all engines of oppression, the very thoughts, desires and emotions of the mind have been read by the ecclesiastical and civil authorities. By means of the knowledge thus obtained, and the mastery thus gained over the people, papal governments have been enabled to carry out their designs, and protect themselves against all opposition.

For proof of the correctness of these remarks look at the past and present condition of Catholic countries, and more particularly at Italy. If the papal church is what it pretends to be, the only channel through which the favors of God are communicated to earth, and if the Pope is the viceroy of Heaven's King, then we should naturally look to the dominions immediately under his cognizance, and the objects of his special care, for the most striking exhibitions of the blessings of civil and religious liberty. But what is the actual state of Italy at the present time, after having enjoyed for twelve centuries all the advantages that popery could confer? Intelligent and truthful travellers assure us that nothing that

greet the eye, wears the mark of enterprise or happiness. On the other hand, decay, deterioration and wretchedness are stamped upon the face of the whole country. The government over which the so called vicar of Christ presides, is made up of injustice, extortion, intrigue, and the worst elements of despotism. Virtue in the subject is no protection, and innocence no safeguard. Trials for crimes committed against the state are conducted in secret; and not unfrequently, it is far preferable to suffer private injuries, rather than resort to the law for redress. Men of property or talents are the objects of constant jealousy and suspicion, and are liable at any moment to feel the grasping power of their priestly rulers. All stimulus to distinction out of the church is taken away, and even all the departments of enterprise and trade are monopolized by the priests. Then, as an additional burden to the people, they are obliged to support an immense army to keep them in subjection. If one breathes of discontent, or gives utterance to the faintest desire for freedom, he is liable to be arrested. If a community confer together with reference to improving their political or social condition, soon bayonets and swords are glistening among them; and the least movement towards rending asunder the chain by which they are bound, is at once suppressed. Through the corruptions of the confessional, domestic happiness is invaded; and the tenderest relations of life are made subservient to the base designs of a priestly despotism. Nor is the condition of the people any better in Austria, or Spain, or Portugal.

Now these Jesuits and their adherents, who are laboring in our country, would substitute this despotism for our liberty, this desolation and these blasted hopes for our prosperity, these obstacles to labor and industry for our spirit of enterprise. They would overthrow our government, to put in its place one which will rob the nation of its growing power, obstruct the channels of business, scatter the seeds of discontent, anarchy and wretchedness, and bring the nation down to a level with the papal countries of Europe. And this they are striving to accomplish, not by the power of argument from their pulpits, not by the splendor of their cathedrals, or the attractions of their worship, (although there is no lack of these means,) — but mainly by educating the rising generation, and by gradually obtaining the control of the ballot-box. The course pursued by Loyola and his followers, after they had gained sufficient influence, and prepared the way by education, was, to

avail themselves of the aid of the civil government, and complete their work by forcing into submission all who would not yield to persuasion. And the same policy would the Jesuits pursue with us to-day, had they the power. They have repeatedly confessed as much; and although they are now silently and cautiously pursuing their work, yet they are full of sanguine expectations that the day is at hand, when they shall be strong enough to strike the decisive blow. And they are urged on by the principle of self-defence, as well as by the desire to extend their system. They feel that they have more to fear from this nation, than from any other upon the globe. They know that our free principles and Protestant faith will continue to work their way among the victims of superstition and oppression in Europe; and they are acting under the conviction that they must either conquer us, or be conquered. In this view they are correct; and would Christians in this land *do their duty*, not only would all danger from Popery be removed from our soil, but we might evangelize the entire continent of Europe, dissipating the deep darkness that enshrouds her deluded millions, and shattering into a thousand fragments those iron systems of despotism with which they are cursed. But we have too much evidence that Protestants are not doing their duty in this matter; and our solicitude is awakened as much by the apathy of the friends of freedom and of pure Christianity, as by the skill, industry and resources of our opponents.

Another point of contrast between this system and our own is, that while our religion makes its appeals to the intellect and heart, popery addresses the external senses, and acts upon the superstition of its followers. It seeks not to enlighten the understanding, and purify the heart, and elevate the affections, and desires and purposes of the soul; but keeps the mind in ignorance, and acts upon its love of show and vain ceremonies. Its priests, professing to be heralds of the truth, fear nothing so much as the truth; professing to lead souls to Christ, their instructions are the greatest obstacle to true conversion. Instead of promoting religion in the heart by the light of God's word, and the influence of sound argument, and the example of a holy life, they depend upon relics, and superstitious rites, and the decrees and dogmas of corrupt councils. At the exhibition of the holy coat at Treves, in 1844, said to be the veritable seamless garment which our Saviour wore, we have an illustration of the power of superstition over the minds of these de-

luded people in this nineteenth century. During the seven weeks that this garment was exhibited, it is estimated that over twenty thousand persons daily visited it, and the ceremony was continued amid the ringing of bells, the roar of cannon, and every manifestation of public rejoicing. As the pilgrims approached the garment, some would devoutly prostrate themselves before it; others would pray to it for the pardon of their sins; and all would cast their offerings into the treasury. The sick were brought to be healed through its efficacy; for they believed that it had imbibed the bloody sweat of Christ's agony in the garden, and had been refulgent with celestial glory on the mount of transfiguration.

Besides the coat, the cross on which our Saviour expired, the spear with which he was pierced, and the table at which the Supper was instituted, are preserved and exhibited. There is a church where the very foot-prints are shown, which St. Peter left impressed upon a marble pavement, when on his way to Rome. In another, is said to be the altar at which he said mass; and in another, the chains which he wore when in prison. A fourth, contains the cradle in which the infant Jesus was rocked; and in a fifth, may be seen the stairs of Pontius Pilate, which Christ ascended. There are thousands of bones, defaced pictures, and other trifles, which are regarded as sacred relics, and viewed with more reverence than the atonement itself. On certain days, too, the solemn farce is enacted of bestowing the priestly blessing upon horses and cattle, and upon the fields and crops.

Missionaries and money are pouring in upon us, to establish here these same mummeries and superstitions. For our pure gospel, the Romanists would give us their baptized Paganism. For our revivals, they would substitute pilgrimages to Baltimore or Cincinnati, to witness and worship a piece of some old garment. For our liberty of conscience, they would give us the iron laws of ecclesiastical despotism. For our charitable societies, they would substitute monasteries and nunneries. Indeed, the wrath of the Pope has already been poured out against our benevolent societies, and particularly against our associations for distributing the Bible; and it is our firm belief that any form of vice, or any calamity, would be endured in Italy with more patience than a Bible society. The appearance of a wasting famine, such as is raging in Ireland, or of the Asiatic cholera, or an outbreak of profligacy that would make virtue a hissing and a by-word, would not

cause greater dismay and pious horror among the ecclesiastics at Rome, than the organization of a Bible society in the imperial city. Let a committee wait upon Pope Pius IX, who now occupies the chair of Peter, and solicit his acceptance of the Presidency of a Bible society, and let the six cardinal bishops be elected vice-presidents, and one of the cardinal deacons be made secretary, and the fifty cardinal priests, who constitute a part of the council of the Pope, be made life-directors by contributions from the Leopold Foundation; and let there be erected under the shadow of the dome of St. Peter's, a Bible house, with its steam-power presses, and its fonts of type, to print the sacred scriptures in Italian, Spanish, French, and Portuguese; and let the use of the church of St. Peter be requested for the purpose of holding the first anniversary of the society, and Pius the Ninth would, in our opinion, be more pious than any of his predecessors, if he did not open fresh vials of his wrath, and issue his bulls, and rain down his curses more copiously than they ever fell upon the head of the monk of Erfurth, Martin Luther, or any of his followers. The Bible and Popery! They can no more be assimilated than can light and darkness, or truth and error. As well might we think of establishing prayer-meetings in the halls of an Inquisition, and associating converting grace with the tortures of the rack.

We have abundant evidence of the hostility of papists to the Bible, in the efforts already made to exclude it from our common schools, and in their care to keep it out of the hands of their people: and the Jesuits, no doubt, design to give us, in time to come, still farther and more emphatic proof of the same feeling.

We might, did our limits allow, institute a comparison between the Catholic clergy and those of the Protestant faith, and point out the notorious infidelity and profligacy of many of the former, and particularly of the ecclesiastics at Rome; we might refer to the zealous efforts that are made to destroy the liberty of the press in papal countries,—to the suppression of the liberty of speech, to the spirit of bitter persecution that popery has, in all ages, manifested, to its union with the state, to the corruption of its nunneries, and the sad revelations of the confessional; but we cannot tax the patience of our readers by a full discussion of these points.

We have seen enough, however, to convince us that a deep, systematic, and extensive plan has been adopted, and is now in progress, to overthrow our institutions, and bring this nation under

the blasting and withering influence of Romanism. Nor has the world ever witnessed a more gigantic undertaking for the production of evil, and the destruction of good, than is presented by this conspiracy against the liberties and religion of these United States. When we consider what this republic has done, and is now doing, for the extension of freedom, for the spread of the gospel, for the promotion of general education, and for the removal of the various forms of human wretchedness, we want language to express our indignation at that base and fiendish undertaking which is aimed against our government, and contemplates the establishment of the curse of popery upon this Protestant soil. Nor was there ever a more strange spectacle presented to the world than that, — while thousands and tens of thousands of the inhabitants of papal countries are flocking to our shores, to enjoy the benefits of our institutions, — the emissaries of the Pope should be laboring to extend here that pernicious system which, in proportion to its prevalence, will make this land so much less an asylum for the oppressed. The simple reason why Catholics are crowding to this Protestant land, is because they cannot live under their own system; and every one can see that, if that system prevails here, their condition among us will be as intolerable as it was at home. Could they leave behind them their bishops, priests, and Jesuit teachers, they might come here with the anticipation of permanently enjoying the blessings of our free government and Protestant faith; but by bringing these enemies of liberty and pure religion with them, they are like persons who, in escaping from an infected district to a healthy region, carry the disease with them, and thus pollute the pure atmosphere, which might have insured their health.

It is, indeed, wonderful, in our apprehension, that the question should not suggest itself to the intelligent Catholic, as he steps upon our shores: "Why have I come to this Protestant land? Why have I left the home of my fathers, the scenes of my childhood, the church in which I was educated, and come to spend the remnant of my days with heretics, — with those whom I have been taught from my infancy to believe were my bitterest enemies, and the vilest of the human race? Have I been banished to this infidel and anathematized land for my crimes? Am I unworthy to enjoy the blessings which Popery confers in those regions, where for ages it has held undisputed sway?" But so blinded are even the most intelligent, that such reflections scarcely ever occur to them;

and while cherishing their prejudices, and laboring to extend Popery here, they do not seem to be aware that they are doing all in their power to destroy the blessings they have come to enjoy.

But we hasten to speak briefly of the manner in which this evil is to be met.

It would be contrary to the spirit of our government and religion to pass laws excluding the Papist from the privileges of our institutions, or to resort to any form of coercive measures to arrest the progress of Romanism. Liberty of conscience and liberty of opinion are principles which lie at the foundation of our republic. The only instrumentality, therefore, which we would employ, is *the power of truth*. Let the Scriptures be circulated; let religious tracts and books be greatly multiplied, and placed in every family in the land; let intelligent and pious teachers be sent forth to counteract the influence of the Jesuits at the West, and let the gospel be preached in its purity and power, and the expectations of the Romanist here, in regard to his supremacy, will never be realized. We have read with what eagerness Luther seized the Bible which he found in the library at Erfurth, how strongly he was excited by the consciousness that he held in his hand the Word of God, and with what indescribable feelings he turned over the leaves of the sacred book, and drank in the rich truths there revealed! We have read how the light from that single volume gradually spread, and grew brighter and brighter, until it extended over Germany, Sweden, Denmark, Scotland and England; and we can trace the fruits of that excellent translation of the Scriptures which Luther made into German, and which for three centuries has supplied that people with the bread of life.

Now our dependance for the protection of our civil institutions and puritan faith is upon the same precious volume, and especially upon having its principles instilled into the minds of the rising generation. And if this work is ever thoroughly done in our land, it must be done speedily. Romanists are crowding upon us faster than they can, with our present means, be instructed and supplied with the bread of life. They are inundating many portions of the land, where the field is clear before them for establishing their own institutions and systems of education. Nor does it need a prophetic eye to discern that, in the future, emigration from Europe will be greatly increased. Our ship-loads of gratuitous supplies of food which have gone forth, are cards of invitation to the destitute

and oppressed, which will be accepted by thousands and tens of thousands. They will reason that if there is such abundance here, and such benevolence as to prompt our citizens to send hundreds of tons of food the distance of three thousand miles to strangers and foreigners, how much more would they find relief in the country itself;* and being disgusted with their own governments, and discouraged by the injustice and oppression to which they have been subjected, they will naturally spend their last farthing to reach our shores. Instead, therefore, of the one hundred thousand which has been about the average for the last ten years, we may expect this year, judging from the number that has already arrived, near half a million; and it should not be forgotten, that there is at this moment surplus population enough in Catholic Europe to come here and out-vote the Protestants at the ballot-box.

The evil, therefore, which we have been considering, if it has not already assumed a formidable aspect, is one which is destined, in a very few years, to make its power sensibly felt in our land. Of this no intelligent observer can for a moment doubt; and the longer we slumber over this subject, the greater will be the probability that we shall awake to a sense of our danger when it will be too late to save the nation.

In comparing the relative strength of Popery and Protestantism in our land, it is important to remember that, while the Papists are united, and all bent upon the extension of their religion, those whom we denominate Protestants are divided; many of them being infidels, and a still larger number being indifferent to all religion; and from the disposition which some political parties have manifested to avail themselves, by compromise, of Catholic votes, to secure their ends, we cannot have that confidence in our numerical Protestant strength which our present majority would seem, at first view, to warrant. The true friends, therefore, of vital religion and civil liberty have duties to perform of a most weighty and pressing character. Let them be faithful, and our institutions, our freedom, and our Protestant faith are safe. But let them neglect their duty, and be recreant to the high trusts committed to them, and our worst fears with reference to the triumph of Popery will be realized.

* The ship-of-war *Jamestown* took out eight hundred tons.

MORAL COURAGE.

IN a more exact analysis of moral courage, we observe, that its foundation is laid in conscious innocence. We do not mean sinless perfection in the sight of God ; for that, we hold, is never attained in this life : nor, on the other hand, mere blamelessness in the eyes of men ; for it is comparatively a small matter to be acquitted or condemned of man's judgment. But we mean purity and uprightness of intention, freedom from acknowledged and allowed wrong, in the judgment of one's own conscience. To have the moral courage of Paul, we must be able to say, as he could : " I know nothing against myself. " He was conscientious even in persecuting the Christians. He sincerely thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth. And there lay the secret of his boldness, as the persecuting Saul of Tarsus. And when he stood up, as the Apostle Paul, to defend Christianity before councils and kings, his strength still lay in the fact, that he had lived in all good conscience before God until that day. Conscious guilt is cowardly and weak. It wants the prime element of strength. It fears, — what it knows it deserves, — the reprobation of others. It has a paralyzing dread of the frowns of Providence, and the sentence of the final Judge. It is waging war with itself, and knows it is at war with all that is greatest and best in the universe. Victory, or strength, or steadfast courage, in such a case, is out of the question. He who aspires to the attainment of this heroic virtue, should remember, that any intended or acknowledged wrong-doing, saps its foundation, since that foundation is laid in conscious rectitude.

But there must be more than this negative virtue. There must be a positive love, — nay, a sacred reverence, for truth and duty. There must be a paramount regard for the true and the right, far above the desirable or the expedient. In short, there must be the supremacy of reason and conscience. These are the characteristic attributes of humanity. These alone constitute man a moral being, and render him capable of any moral virtue. And these are the proper governing principles in the human soul. They claim the throne, and disdain to occupy any subordinate place. Their dictates are in their very nature imperative. They demand the implicit obedience of every appetite, passion and pro-

pensity in the breast of man. Of course, there is no alternative between the supremacy of these rightful sovereigns, and civil war or anarchy, which must of necessity distract and weaken, if not divide and destroy the soul. The insurrection and wrongful ascendancy of the passions may inspire a kind of courage. But it is blind and mad, it is not moral, but a most immoral courage. It may impart a temporary strength. But it is fitful, exhausting and self-destroying, like the strength of a deranged patient, or the convulsive energies of a frantic people. The calm strength of a healthy intellect, the resistless courage of a great and good heart, the collected energies of a mind in harmony with itself, — these are to be seen only under the absolute supremacy of reason and conscience. This is the essence of all true courage; for it is so much greater and stronger, as well as higher and better, than any other, that no other in comparison deserves the name. This is especially the essence of *moral* courage, for the supremacy of reason and conscience alone gives it a moral character.

He, in whose breast reason and conscience reign supreme, will have a mind of his own, for his inquiry is not, What does such a man think, and what do people in general say? He asks, rather, What is true, and what is the decision of reason in view of all the facts in the case? And he will have the firmness to maintain his principles, and act upon them, for the first question with him is not as to what is popular, or what is prudent, or what is expedient; but what is right. Should he meet with insults, and injuries, and loss of property, or loss of life even, in the course of his duty, it will not touch the foundation, on which either his decisions or his actions rest. Truth is immutable. So is right. And he who has anchored his spirit to these, will not be blown about by every wind of doctrine, or float passive down every current of influence. He will fear no storm or flood. The strength of the everlasting hills is his, for he has cast his anchor there. The fixedness of the eternal stars is also his, for he pierces through the darkest cloud, and looks calmly on their unchanging and perpetual light. Truth is beautiful; and the soul that loves it, is changed into the same image. Truth is mighty, and so is the soul that feeds upon it. Let others exult in each new addition to their hoarded wealth. But let our Eureka, like that of the ancient philosopher, be shouted at some new discovery in literature, science, or the arts; or at the successful working out of some great problem in morals or religion.

Then should we, in our last days, be beleaguered by enemies and beset with dangers on every side, still we may meet our end, like the same philosopher, in the rapt contemplation of some sublime truth, and though we be cut down suddenly in the midst of our problem, we may hope to find its speedy solution in the clearer light of another world. Let others give themselves up to the gratification of the appetites and passions, or to the exclusive culture of the intellectual powers; let memory pore over the buried past, forgetful alike of the present and the future; or imagination revel in the realms of fiction, till it loses all relish for the sober realities of life; or judgment act the heartless and fruitless critic's part, as if there were nothing else to do in this busy solemn world, but to pass censure on the faults of others. But in our breast, let conscience sit enthroned with reason as her counselor, and every other power and susceptibility, whether of body or mind, run in swift obedience to her mandates, in the willing discharge of the subordinate duties for which they were severally made. Then should we learn the truth and significance of those lines, whose words from earliest childhood have been familiar to our heart:

"One self-approving smile whole years outweighs,
Of stupid starers, and of loud huzzas;
And more true joy Marcellus exiled feels,
Than Cæsar with a senate at his heels."

Then, too, we should reach that consummation so eagerly sought by ancient sages, the sound mind in a sound body. But alas for the age in which we live, it is more busy in the manufacture of machinery, than in the education of *men*. Knowledge is little coveted, any farther than it can be converted into steam-power, or power to rule the State. And duty, if not already an obsolete idea, is quite secondary, both to wealth and popular favor.

The fear of man bears sway among us, more than the fear of God; and the whispers of conscience, and the still small voice of the Divine Spirit, are drowned in the tumults or applauses of the people. If gain is the godliness of the many, popularity is the idol of the few and the great. Shame on us! If we can find nothing to invigorate our conscience in the eventful history of our own age and country, nothing in the high moral tone of our old English literature, and nothing in the divine precepts of our

holy religion, let us go to Athens and animate our sense of duty in the school of the moral philosopher of pagan antiquity ! See him refuse to put an unconstitutional question to vote in the popular assembly, though the multitude threatened to tear him in pieces for his conscientious scruples. Hear him, when, on trial for his life, he declines an acquittal which was offered him on condition of silence for the future ; and declares that, so long as he lives, he will not cease to proclaim the truth which he has received from God in the ears of those to whom God has sent him. Hear him in prison, answering the arguments of his disciples who entreat him to make his escape as he may easily do ; and disdaining to consider any other point, than the single question, whether it is right for him thus to evade the execution of his unjust sentence. Finally see him drink the hemlock, calm amid a circle of weeping friends ; and die with a happy composure, worthy of his courageous and heroic life. And then, if we cannot find a more perfect example, let us go and do likewise.

MODERN JERUSALEM.

LET us join ourselves to that company of pilgrims, on their way from Yaffa (Joppa) to Jerusalem. They are a motley group ; of all nations and creeds, Jews and Gentiles, Moslems and Christians, Papist, Greek, Armenian, Copt and Protestant. They cluster together from a sense of common danger on the route. They have brought the costumes and language of their own land with them, and are variously armed with the pilgrim's staff, — in need an efficient club, — the sword and the gun ; and mounted on mules, asses, or fiery Arabs, or on foot, they hurry confusedly along the path.

Our route lies across the plain of Sharon, spreading northward towards the barrier of Mount Carmel. You leave Ramleh, possibly the Arimathea of Joseph, behind you ; and cross the vale of Ajalon. You pass Ajalon, the village nestling on the hill side. You enter the hill country of Judah ; and your path, leaving the plain, lies, in part, in the dry bed of a torrent, or on its borders, alternating from one bank to the other. It is usually as wide as

a cart track, and covered with loose rubble limestone, whose rough points have been rounded by the tramp of generations. The path often ascends the slope, and crosses the mountain crests. The rock is bare, and polished like statuary marble; sometimes you pass over its slippery surface, then you find surer footing, the mule planting her hoofs in holes worn by travel at regular intervals, to the depth of three or four inches. No wheel-carriage ever could have passed from Ramleh to Jerusalem; and in New England, we should suppose it impracticable for any creature. In the valleys, your path winds among flowering shrubs, beautiful and fragrant; and the vine, the apricot tree, the almond, and the fig, occasionally cheer the way. At times, you discern on the slopes of the mountains, the ruins of massive terraces, the wrecks of ancient civilization, ascending from the base far up towards the summit. Modern terraces of loose limestone are frequent, and occasional orchards of the olive occur; but as you ascend the mountains, vegetation is rarer. The bare rock is visible, and the bald summits lift themselves in gray desolation toward heaven.

As you enter the hills from the plain, you find under a sheltering crag, an old Arab, with refreshments before him. It is a follower of Abu Goosh, a mountain robber, whose nest is among the cliffs above you. Ten years ago, and Abu Goosh would have stripped you to your hat; but now he is content, more quietly to levy black mail, in an extravagant price for a cup of coffee; and this old mummy is his agent. As you leave him, a dozen Bedouins, on their desert steeds, with lances couched, gallop over the rocky path, where you are thinking of dismounting. Their wild mien and whirlwind rush are an admonition strong, that they have the power to take the tribute you may grudgingly give.

Hardly a village occurs from the plain to the city, and an isolated dwelling never. The solitude is unbroken, save by the cheerful song of the muleteer, or the muttered prayer of the pilgrim. Occasionally you detect a shepherd leading his kids among the crags. Yet he is no Arcadian swain, with fife or lute to lead the village dance; but a swart Arab, with sandalled foot, a robe of loose cotton girt with leather, a shawl thrown over the head, shadowing his black serpent-eyes, and bound round the temples with a skein of yarn from the wool of the black sheep. His crook is a long Damascus matchlock; and a murderous sword is stuck in his belt before him. He looks as if expecting to be robbed

himself, and ready to rob in turn. Who can say what backers he has got amidst the crags. Pass him quietly with the oriental salutation: "Peace be with you!" He answers: "On you be peace!" And all is well.

Five and a half hours of travel from the plain, brings you in sight of the crest of Olivet; and you rush onward, with reckless speed, to catch the first glimpse of the holy city. Jerusalem is before you. The pilgrims hail it with shouts. The more thoughtful kneel, and mingle their prayers with the sulphurous incense of flashing guns from their lighter hearted fellows. But what are your thoughts, in approaching Jerusalem? The past blends with the present. All you have read, all you have thought and felt on things sacred, commingle strangely with present impressions, and leave you, for a time, incapable of disentangling your confused sentiments. Is it Jerusalem? Is it possible, that the dream of childhood, the hope of youth, the firm purpose of manhood, are turned into reality, — and is Jerusalem before you? You were told about it at your mother's knee. The principles which guide your life, the elements of your faith, the strength of undying hopes, the consolation of adversity, the very frame-work of your soul, all have their beginnings in Jerusalem. And here, at last, you stand where Abraham taught you faith, and David praise; where heaven-moved prophets spake; and the thoughts of God uttered by human lips, became bread from heaven in the nurture of your soul. Here you stand where Jesus Christ hallowed the dust with his footsteps, and opened the gates of heaven by his cross. Here the Saviour lived, and here he died.

Three quarters of an hour from the first sight of Olivet, brings you to the gate of Jerusalem. You are stopped by the bayonet of a Turkish soldier, who questions you in hopes to extort a fee from the impatient Frank. Touch not those lepers as you enter; they are here still, but Christ is not here to heal them. Cast an alms into the basket, they hold up to you. Enter Jerusalem with mercy in your hands.

Let us take a rapid view of modern Jerusalem.

The hill country of Judea, is bounded on the north, by the plain of Esdraelon, running from the Jordan to Mount Carmel, and the bay of Acre: on the east, by the valley of the Jordan, and the Dead Sea: on the south, by the great desert; and on the west, it sinks away into the vast plain of Philistia, receding from the sea

as it passes southward. This mountain region, is about ninety-five miles in breadth ; and is cut by ravines and torrent beds, which drain its waters into the Jordan eastward, or into the sea westward. On the summit of this range, at an elevation of twenty-five hundred French feet, lies Jerusalem on a bold bluff, whose surface has the general character of a plain, with an inclination to the eastward. The bluff falls abruptly down into the valley of Hinnom, on the west and south ; and into the valley of Jehoshaphat, on the east. The summit of the bluff is broken into four irregular swells. That on the south, is Mount Zion, standing in the angle formed by the union of the valleys of Hinnom and Jehoshaphat, or of the Kedron. On the west, is the swell of Acra. On the east, is that of Moriah : and on the north, is that of Bezetha. A shallow valley commences in the northern part of the city, and separates Bezetha and Moriah on the east of it, from Acra and Zion on the west ; a like depression in the surface divides Acra from Zion, and the two unite and form a deep ravine, with an abrupt inclination ending in the vale of Kedron, between Zion and Moriah.

The city is walled and has four gates, the west gate leading to Joppa, Bethlehem, and Hebron ; the north gate leading to Shechem and Damascus ; the east gate, to Bethany and the Dead Sea ; and the south gate, to the brow of Zion, without the walls. The trace of the walls runs as close as the abrupt descent will admit to the valley of Hinnom, on the west, and to the valley of Jehoshaphat, on the east. The breadth of the city, according to Dr. Robinson, is one thousand and twenty yards. The city wall, on the south, leaves a considerable part of Zion without its trace, and passes across the bluff, with a zigzag course, from Hinnom to Kedron. On the north, the wall, with less irregularity, finds its limit also in the two vallies.

The present walls are of Saracenic origin, and were built by Sultan Suleiman, in 1542. The stones are hewn, and laid in cement ; and many of them are apparently fragments of former structures. The height varies from twenty to sixty feet, according to the nature of the ground. The wall is single, with a breastwork to protect infantry ; but has not the breadth to support artillery, except at the towers forming the gateway. On the right of the gate of Jaffa, as you enter, is the citadel, with a dry ditch before it, and mounting a few guns. This citadel is, proba-

bly, the tower of Hippicus, and possibly may embrace the old tower of David. The walls on the east and west, probably run nearly on the foundations of the ancient bulwarks; but at the north and south, they have shrunk away, leaving at least one half of the ancient city outside of the present defences. The whole circuit of the walls, is two and a half English miles.

The first allusion to a city on this site, is in Genesis, where Melchisedek is spoken of as its king. The Canaanites were dislodged from their defences on Acra, by the tribe of Judah; and took refuge on Zion, where they retained their hold, until conquered by David, who built upon it the city of David. Moriah, memorable for the faith of Abraham, and for the arrest of the destroying angel at the threshing floor of Araunah, the Jebusite, was made sacred by the glories of the temple and the presence of God. Bezetha was added to the city, when its increasing population had broken beyond its ancient bounds. Moriah was originally a rocky summit, rising sharply up from Kidron. When it was determined to place the temple upon it, the rough summit was smoothed; and, to increase the area, a series of arches, which yet remain, were built, and the top covered with earth. A massive wall supported the elevated area, which took the form of a parallelogram. The wall of the area was also, as far as it ran externally, the wall of the city on the side of Kidron. It is here that we find the most marked indications of ancient magnificence. At various spots, external to the city, and also at points of the wall, towards the city, the eye detects at a glance the wide difference between the lower tiers of stones and those above. Above, the masonry is loose and rude, and formed of fragments of every kind. Among them you will detect the capitals of pillars, columns of marble of beautiful colors, protruding from the wall; and particularly that on which Mahomet is to sit, according to Mahometans, when he judges the world. But the lower ranges of stone are exceedingly massive, and reach the lengths, in several instances, of twenty-four and thirty feet. The surface is smoothed, and the edge of the stone is cut away for two inches; so that where the blocks are placed one on the other, there is a shallow groove at the joining, and the face of the stone takes the appearance of a panel. There is no indication that these gigantic blocks of limestone have ever been displaced, since first the hand of man placed them where they are. At the

inner corner of the temple wall, where it approaches the nearest to Zion, from which it is separated by the ravine, called the Tyropoeon, the abutments of an arch appear springing from the wall. This arch is apparently the remnant of the bridge which, as Josephus tell us, connected the temple with Zion, and across which, the Jews retreated when the temple was taken by Titus. Following the trace of these massive blocks, it becomes clear, that the area on which the Moslems have reared the Mosque of Omar, is substantially the area of the Jewish temple. The work, however, takes in the probable site of the tower of Antonia, on the north. The area is fifteen hundred feet long by nine hundred and fifty feet broad. It is regarded by Mahometans, as a sacred spot ; and only less holy than Mecca.

The inhabitants of Jerusalem are distributed, according to creed, into Mahometans, Jews, and Christians. The total of the population is about twelve thousand. Of these, the Moslems furnish rather more than one third ; and the Jews and Christians, the remainder in nearly equal numbers. There is usually, beside these, a garrison of from five hundred to eight hundred Turkish soldiers. Jerusalem is a holy city to them all ; and their quarters have reference to their holy places. The Jews cluster on the brow of Zion, opposite the temple, whence they may gaze on the spot where once the temple stood, but on which, they are forbidden to enter. The Christians gather about the Holy Sepulchre, on a tract which they regard as that where Jesus Christ was crucified, and buried, and raised again. The Mahometans dwell between the Jews and the Christians, and back of Mount Moriah.

The houses of Jerusalem are low and gloomy, built usually of faced stone, and seldom rising above two stories. The lower story is appropriated to menial offices, and to stables ; and the upper, to sleeping apartments. The roofs are flat, with a wall about them breast high, and a dome or chambers built upon the roof. They are often constructed with an inner court ; and always with capacious cisterns, either hewn out of the solid limestone, or formed of blocks, and in either case, faced with cement of great thickness. The houses present an exceedingly dull and cheerless aspect from the streets, the dead wall being scarcely broken by a single window, and that usually resembling a loop-hole for musquetry, rather than an inlet for the cheerful light of day.

The streets are very narrow, and no where adapted for carriages. Indeed, there is not a single wheeled carriage in the city, unless it be a gun-carriage. Every thing, whether of persons or effects, is borne on the backs of asses, horses and camels. The streets are rudely flagged. There are many noble blocks of limestone among the flags, once doubtless the ornaments of palaces; and in one instance, we see the cross of Malta, on one of the stones of the footpath. The streets are exceedingly filthy. Offals, the sweepings of stables, and all manner of abominations, are cast reeking into the narrow and shaded streets, to ferment into pestilence and death. The bazaars are mean, and the show of merchandise is trumpery and insignificant. You will find more of interest in the varied costume of the people. The general dress is oriental, the turban and its appendages. The language is Arabic. But you have, beside the wild roamer of the desert, Monks, Greek, Papist, Armenian, Copt, Nestorian, and Jacobite, — people from Greece, Russia, Abyssinia, and farthest Persia, all come to bow where Jesus died and rose again. The dreary uniformity of the city, is somewhat broken by the Latin and Greek convents, built for the accommodation of pilgrims; and by the minarets of the Mosques, and the domes of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Mosque of Omar.

PRESIDENT QUINCY'S MISSTATEMENTS EXPOSED AND CORRECTED.

NO. VI.

PRESIDENT QUINCY'S statements in regard to the origin and history of Yale College, have been justly blamed for their want of accuracy. "A desire," he says, "had long existed in that colony, (Connecticut,) for the establishment in it of a school of the prophets, constructed with reference to their peculiar religious views." Vol. i. P. 197. Now the fact is, the Connecticut colonists had, at this period, nothing peculiar in their religious views. They were Calvinistic and Congregational; and so were their brethren in Massachusetts. In respect to religious faith and order, they were one people.

President Quincy goes on to say, that the projectors of the new seminary in Connecticut, were very anxious that it should be made satisfactory to the stricter party in Massachusetts; that, with this view, they applied to Chief Justice Sewall and Mr. Secretary Addington, for the draft of a charter; that a draft was prepared by those gentlemen and sent on, "not founded, like the charters at Harvard, on 'the instituting, guiding, and furthering of the said college, and the several members thereof, from time to time, in piety, morality, and learning,' but on something which they, doubtless, deemed more safe and scriptural, the reciting *memoriter*, the Assembly's Catechism in Latin, Dr. Ames's Medulla, and also his Cases of Conscience, accompanied on the Sabbath by expositions of practical theology, and the repeating of sermons, and on week days by reading and expounding the Scriptures;" that this draft was adopted, without any material alterations, by the founders of the College in Connecticut; that, "from this period, the College of Connecticut began to be deemed by the stricter ~~sect~~ of Calvinists, the strong hold of their opinions;" and that "their favor soon became to that institution an element of worldly prosperity and success." Pp. 198, 199.

Without imputing any improper motives or bad intentions to President Quincy, we are constrained to say, that the above statement, in nearly every branch and member of it, is little better than a tissue of misrepresentations. In the first place, there was no foundation at that time, among the Congregationalists of New England, for the distinction so much insisted on by President Quincy, between the strict and the moderate Calvinists. They were all Calvinists, on the ground of the Westminster symbols, — the Brattles, and Colman, and Willard, and Leverett, as really so as Sewall, or Addington, or the Mathers. And if there had been such a distinction as President Quincy supposes, there is no evidence that the Connecticut ministers made suit to the stricter class, more than to the laxer. No indication of any such fact or motive as President Quincy has imputed to them, can be discovered in any record of their early proceedings.

The draft of a charter, furnished by Sewall and Addington, was also a very different thing from what President Quincy represents it. In the original paper, which still exists in the archives of Yale College, there is nothing about "reciting *memoriter*, the Assembly's Catechism;" nothing about Ames' "Cases of Con-

science ;" nothing about "expositions of practical theology," or "reading and expounding the Scriptures."

And that "the founders of the College in Connecticut adopted, without any material alterations, the draft" furnished them from Boston, is far from being an accurate statement. This draft arrived only just in time for the friends of the college to glance at it previous to the final action of the legislature ; and almost no use was made of it in the charter which was enacted.

And so far was "the college in Connecticut" from being deemed, thenceforward, "by the stricter sect of Calvinists, the strong hold of their opinions," that in 1714, only a few years after Yale College went into operation, we find Dr. Colman distressed with the apprehension that it was becoming infected with Arminianism ; and beseeching one of the trustees to look into the matter, and clear it, if possible, from so foul "an aspersion."

Nor did the favor of the Boston Calvinists become to the new college "an element of worldly prosperity and success." It does not appear that a student went to Yale College, from the eastern part of Massachusetts, for more than forty years ; or that a shilling was received into its treasury from any part of Massachusetts, for more than a century.*

It is made matter of complaint in this connection, that some of "the sons of Harvard solicited donations for Yale College, and even attempted to give the tide of individual bounty, which was flowing towards Cambridge, a direction towards New Haven." P. 199. That some of the sons of Harvard, solicited donations for Yale Collegé, during the period of its infancy, I hope may be admitted without offence. Not a few of them resided in Connecticut, some as settled ministers, others as magistrates ; and while they did not forget the college at Cambridge, and in some instances, contributed liberally to its funds,† it was natural that they should feel a deep interest in the college of their own State ; and that Cotton Mather should be able to extend his views beyond

* For these and other important facts, we are indebted, chiefly, to a Review of President Quincy's History, published in the American Biblical Repository, Second Series, Vols. vi. and vii.

† The Hon. Gurdon Saltonstall, for many years Governor of Connecticut, bequeathed one hundred pounds, lawful money, to Harvard College. His wife gave no less than eleven hundred pounds to the same Institution, Vol. i. P. 420.

the little circle of Boston and Cambridge, and assist, by his letters and influence, in procuring funds for the new college in Connecticut, ought to be regarded as evidence of a liberal mind, — of a noble, expansive and generous spirit. It should be recorded to his honor, and not to his reproach, that he secured for the new college, the patronage of the Hon. Mr. Yale; on which account, it soon after received the name, which it still so honorably bears.

At a later period, President Quincy recurs to his favorite idea, that Yale College “had been founded under the auspices of persons discontented with the religious state of Harvard,” and adds: “After the lapse of half a century, it was again regarded as the place of refuge, in the impending dangers of the Calvinistic faith. Accordingly, in the year 1752, the clergy of Connecticut, with the co-operation of the Calvinistic sect in Massachusetts, sedulously began the task of settling and securing Orthodoxy in the college at New Haven. In November, 1753, the president and fellows of that seminary, passed votes, declaring that the students should be established in the principles of religion, according to the Assembly’s Catechism, Dr. Ames’s Medulla, and Cases of Conscience, and should not be suffered to be instructed in any different principles or doctrines.” Vol. ii. P. 70.

In the statements here made, President Quincy is as far from accuracy, as in those which have been already examined. In the year 1753, the president and fellows of Yale College, did indeed pass an act, with the design “to preserve and secure the religion of the college upon its original foundation and constitution;” in which they declare that “the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, are the only rule of faith and practice in all matters of religion;” that “the Assembly’s Catechism and Confession of Faith, contain a true and just summary of the most important doctrines of the Christian religion;” that “every person who shall hereafter be chosen a President, Fellow, Professor of Divinity, or Tutor, shall publicly give his consent to the said Catechism and Confession of Faith, and renounce all doctrines or principles, contrary thereto;” but that “Protestants of all denominations, may send their children to receive the advantages of college,” provided they will conform to its laws and orders.* It does not appear, however, that “the Calvinistic sect in Massachu-

* Baldwin’s Annals of Yale Collage. P. 68.

setts," or even "the clergy of Connecticut," as a body, exerted the slightest influence in procuring this act; or that it grew out of any suspicions of heresy, as at that time, prevailing in and around Boston. On "the New Light" question, which, at that period, was the one of principal interest, the college at New Haven, had taken much the same ground as that at Cambridge. Both opposed Whitefield and the Revivalists, and sided rather with Chauncy, than with Edwards, in point of religious feeling and views. But a Professorship of Divinity, was now to be instituted in Yale College. An individual was to be set apart to preach to the students, and instruct them in the doctrines and duties of religion. And by President Clap and others, the opportunity was thought to be a favorable one, for providing against those perversions to which public institutions are always exposed, and "securing the religion of the college upon its original foundation." There is nothing, however, in the act passed at this time, requiring that "the students should be established in the principles of religion, according to the Assembly's Catechism, Dr. Ames's Medulla, and Cases of Conscience, and should not be suffered to be instructed in any different principles or doctrines." The preamble states that *formerly* there had been a regulation of this nature; but the act itself lays no such injunction for the time to come. President Quincy's statement in regard to this matter is, therefore, without foundation.

It was, during the presidency of Mr. Leverett, that the bounty of Hollis first began to flow towards Harvard College. As there are some points connected with his donations which have long been matter of dispute, and to which President Quincy has thought proper to devote a considerable space, it will be necessary to examine them with special care.

The bounty of Hollis, when it had begun to flow, was like a perennial stream. As President Quincy remarks: "Scarcely a ship sailed from London, during the last ten years of his life, without bearing some evidence of his affection and liberality." The particular objects of his bounty were, first, the library; to the enlargement of which he devoted much time and care, as well as money. Secondly, "the maintenance and education of pious young men for the ministry, who are poor in this world." And, thirdly, the endowment of professorships. He endowed a Professorship of Divinity, in 1721, and a Professorship of Mathematics,

in 1726. He also sent over a philosophical apparatus, worth one hundred and fifty pounds sterling, and founts of Greek and Hebrew types.

The endowment which, from the first, has excited the deepest interest, and led to the most frequent discussion, was that of the professorship of divinity. President Quincy devotes almost a whole chapter to the consideration of this subject; and not a few of his statements require to be examined. One would think, from his representations, that Hollis had fallen into the hands of a class of rogues and jockeys, who were determined to get his money, and yet defeat his liberal designs; and that they actually did "defeat the provision of his statutes, which rendered a Baptist eligible to his professorship, and substituted, in place of a belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, a declaration of faith in all the high points of New England Calvinism."* P. 291. A simple narrative of the facts in the case, will show how this matter is;—after which, we may inquire as to the probable design of President Quincy, and others, in laboring to distort these facts.

In the year 1720, Mr. Hollis learned, incidentally, from Dr. Colman, that there was no professor of divinity in Harvard College; at which he expressed some surprise, and prayed to be informed immediately, "what would be a meet salary or stipend for one." Without waiting for an answer to this inquiry, he, early in the spring of 1721, prepared and sent over a paper, giving directions how the money that had been paid by him to Harvard College, or that might be paid in his life time, or by his executor, should be invested, and how "the proceeds thereof should be expended." A part of these proceeds was to be given for the support of a professor of divinity; a part for the assistance of poor and pious young men; and a small sum was to be given

* The "stricter Calvinists" are represented by President Quincy, as the authors of all this trickery and mischief. These "stricter Calvinists," like some evil genius, seem to haunt the brain of the venerable ex-president, and are sure to stalk in, on all occasions of difficulty. It is a comfort to know that the Mathers, at this time, had but little to do with the College. President Leverett was at the head of it, where he had been for almost twenty years. Dr. Colman was a prominent member of the corporation, and the individual through whom the correspondence with Hollis was chiefly conducted.

annually to the college treasurer, "for his pains in receiving and paying over my bounty."

President Quincy represents this paper as the proper *foundation* of the professorship of divinity, and as embodying all the rules and orders which Hollis contemplated with respect to it. But it seems that Hollis did not so regard it; for in letters accompanying the paper itself, he requests "further advice and information in that affair," viz., "the setting up a professorship of divinity at the college." In compliance with this request of Mr. Hollis, "a draft" or "scheme of a professorship," was prepared and transmitted to him. In general, this "New England scheme" met with his cordial approbation; though he thought that it needed *some amendments*. Accordingly, he consulted several eminent ministers in and around London, desiring them to make such alterations and suggestions as to them appeared needful, intending afterwards to send it back to New England "for more mature consideration" there. The "scheme" or "draft of orders," as amended in London, was at length returned to New England; was accepted by the corporation of the college; and (with some slight modification,) by the overseers. It was thus made satisfactory to all parties, and was finally sanctioned by Mr. Hollis, in 1723. Subsequent to this, Mr. Hollis claimed and received a written obligation from the corporation, *binding them and their successors* faithfully to fulfil the orders, as they had been written. In a letter to Dr. Colman at this time, Mr. Hollis says: "Since my orders are now signed and sealed with you, *keep but honestly to them, and I shall be pleased*; not having any design at present to alter them, unless I see some very great reason for it."

President Quincy will have it, after all, that Hollis was *not pleased* with his orders: they were not what he originally intended; they were rather *forced* upon him by his too officious New England friends, than cordially adopted as a matter of his own choice. He was specially displeased with the eleventh and last article, which enjoins that the professor be "a man of solid learning in divinity, of *sound and Orthodox principles*." P. 248.

But how does President Quincy know what he so confidently states in relation to these matters? If he knows it at all, his knowledge must have been received by supernatural revelation; for certainly the documents contain no such intimations. The

indications to be gathered from them, are all in the opposite direction. The "New England scheme" or "draft," was not urged upon Hollis, but transmitted in answer to his own *request*. Nor did he ever make any complaint that his friends had transcended his request, and sent over more than he desired. He thought the "scheme" needed some amendment, and he committed it to the hands of certain ministers of his acquaintance for that purpose; but how does President Quincy know, — what he expressly affirms, — that it was the *eleventh article*, which Hollis thought "required amendment or modification?" Does he anywhere say so? Or do the ministers to whom he referred it? So far from this, they returned the eleventh article *unaltered*; and Hollis returned it *unaltered* to New England; thus unequivocally indicating that, in the judgment of all concerned on the other side of the water, this article required no modification. And when it was slightly amended afterwards, in the board of overseers, so as to be of a more imperative character, Hollis made no objection to it; but sanctioned it as one of the orders of his professorship to the end of time.

But it is said, that, although Hollis consented to adopt the eleventh article, he virtually and intentionally nullified it, by immediately subjoining, as a part of his statutes, "that the only declaration required of his professor should be, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only perfect rule of faith and manners." Pp. 249, 256, 263. But how, we ask again, does President Quincy know what the intentions of Mr. Hollis were, in requiring his professor to make the above declaration? He talks and reasons about his intentions with as much confidence and familiarity, as though he had been present at the time to converse with him, or to look directly into the good man's heart. Mr. Hollis never intimated that he had any design or thought of nullifying or modifying, by the above declaration, the eleventh article of his orders; nor is there anything in the declaration itself, which renders such a design probable. May not a person be "sound and Orthodox," and yet "receive the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only perfect rule of faith and manners?" Or rather, we would ask, can a person be "sound and orthodox," in any acceptance of these terms, who does not receive the Scriptures in this way?

But President Quincy is not correct, in representing the declaration above quoted, as constituting "a substantive part" of the "rules and orders" of Hollis. The "rules and orders" are a paper by themselves, consisting of eleven articles, signed and sealed by the hand of the founder. The declaration referred to, is contained in another paper, entitled "a plan or form for the professor of divinity to agree to, at his inauguration."

Still further from accuracy, is President Quincy, in repeatedly representing that a profession of belief in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, is the only declaration to be required of the professor. So far from being the only declaration, it is but one among many others. At his inauguration, according to the "form" above referred to, the professor must first "repeat his oaths to the civil government;" then he must "declare his belief in the Scriptures, as before stated;" next, he "promises to open and explain the Scriptures to his pupils, with integrity and faithfulness, according to the best light that God shall give him." He also "promises to promote true piety and godliness, by his example and instruction;" to "consult the good of the college, and the peace of the churches, on all occasions;" and "*religiously to observe the statutes of his founder.*"* P. 538. These several declarations and engagements are all contained, not in the "rules and orders" of Hollis, but in his "plan or form for the professor of divinity to agree to, at his inauguration." Yet our author twice asserts "that the only declaration required of the professor should be, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only perfect rule of faith and manners." Pp. 256, 263.

President Quincy supposes that the design of Hollis, in requiring the above declaration was, that a Baptist might not be excluded from the Professor's chair, under the eleventh article of his orders, on the ground that he was not Orthodox. But Hollis had effectually provided against such an interpretation, in the *first* article of his orders, which makes the Baptist equally eligible to the office, as the Congregationalist, or the Presbyterian. According to the first article, the professor must "be a Master of Arts, and in communion with some Christian church of one of the three denominations, Congregationalist, Presbyterian, or Baptist."

* How could this have been required in the "form of inauguration," if the intention of the form had been to nullify one of the most important of "the statutes of the founder?"

How would it be possible for men, who had proposed this article to Hollis, and adopted it, and bound themselves and their successors to abide by it, afterwards to exclude a man from the office, on the simple ground that he was a Baptist, and that a Baptist was not "sound and orthodox." At any rate, if this first article would not prevent the corporation from excluding a Baptist, the declaration in the form of inauguration would present no kind of obstacle to such a procedure.

President Quincy thinks that, in examining Mr. Wigglesworth, the first Hollis professor of divinity, on the points of Calvinism, and more especially in regard to his belief of infant baptism, the corporation of the college showed an utter disregard of the wishes of Hollis, and even of his written orders. The ex-president is indignant that Mr. Wigglesworth, should have been examined at all, and particularly that he should have been examined on such points as those above referred to. P. 255. But what indignity was it, either to the founder of the professorship, or to the candidate for office, that he was required to be examined? According to Mr. Pierce, up to this time, and for years afterwards, *all* the college officers, "even the tutors, were examined as to their religious principles;"* and it would have been strange indeed, if the new professor of divinity had been exempted. And the orders of Hollis, so far from being violated by a formal examination, could not have been intelligently fulfilled without it. The professor must be a man of "solid learning in divinity, and of sound and orthodox principles." But how should an individual be known to be such a man, whatever meaning may be attached to these terms, until he had been tried and proved?

The points of Calvinism, on which Mr. Wigglesworth was examined, show conclusively what was meant by the term *orthodox*, in the days of Hollis. No man then could be soundly orthodox, who was not soundly Calvinistic. That a Calvinistic Baptist was held to be Orthodox, is evident from a comparison of the first of the orders of Hollis, with the eleventh. The professor, according to the first, *might* be a Baptist. But according to the eleventh, he

* Mr. Pierce thinks Mr. Winthrop, the second Hollis Professor of Mathematics, was the first college officer that had ever been elected, without a strict inquiry into his religious principles. History of Harvard University, P. 188.

must be Orthodox. Hence, in the judgment of all concerned in the framing and adopting of these orders, the profession of Baptist principles was consistent with orthodoxy. And hence the examination of Mr. Wigglesworth, in regard to his belief of infant baptism, could have had no reference to the question of his orthodoxy, or to his qualification for office according to the rules of Hollis; but must have been for the private satisfaction of some or all of the electors. There was nothing contradictory to the rules of Hollis in this part of the examination; since, whether they found the candidate a believer in infant baptism or not, they had a right, by the rules, to elect him. And as they had perfect liberty to go into such an examination, doubtless some of the electors felt that they should be better satisfied, after an examination had taken place.

President Quincy presumes that Hollis never knew of this examination, from the fact that he made no complaint in regard to it. P. 256. But we see not why he should have complained, if he had known it. He knew almost every thing else that took place with respect to the college, about this time; and there is no reason to doubt that he was made early and fully acquainted with this. He certainly would approve of the examination on all the points, unless it were that of infant baptism. He expected the corporation to examine his professor, and satisfy themselves that he was "sound and orthodox." He would have blamed them, and with good reason, had they consented to act in the dark, in relation to a matter of so much importance. And with regard to the examination on infant baptism, as it would be a gratification to some of the electors, and as there was nothing in it inconsistent with his orders, he doubtless was willing that they should do as they pleased. As the examination of Professor Wigglesworth was a public matter, the results of which, after long debates, were entered on the records of the overseers; and as Hollis was certainly informed of these debates, and found fault with the spirit manifested in them; it is morally certain that he knew of the examination. We see not how it could have been kept from him; or why any one, at that day, should have desired to keep it from him. And as he uttered no complaint in regard to it, the conclusion is, that it met his approbation. Thus the unsupported surmises of President Quincy fall headlong, and come to nought.

RICHARD BLACKERBY.

WHEN we view the heavens on a clear night, we may see above two thousand spots, which seem like whitish clouds, and are called *nebulae*. If these faintly luminous spots are viewed through the telescope, they are found to be clusters of distinct stars, far distant from each other, but so inconceivably remote from us, that their thin and scattered rays only reach us in that hazy appearance. It is somewhat thus in history, where many a bright cloud meets the eye, made up of burning and shining lights, whose lustre can no longer, through the dim and misty distance, be separately discerned. Though there be many stars of various magnitudes, which struggle through the darkness of oblivion, yet these are as nothing in respect to number, and perhaps as to real greatness, in comparison with those heavenly hosts, whose fading beams are blended to us into a pale whiteness, like that of the Milky Way. The ancient martyrs form such a nebula; the Waldenses are another; and among many more, the Puritans are another, whose soft and lovely radiance garnishes the heavens.

Many of these worthies, through some happily preserved memorials, shine forth in distinct effulgence, among the "living lights" of every following age. But he whose name stands at the head of this article, is one of that countless throng, whose luminous life is almost lost amid the general field of contemporary goodness. It is a part of the business of our "Observatory" to restore some such to the reader's view, that he may conjecture by them what the whole "nebula" must have been.

Richard Blackerby was a right holy and learned divine; a native of Worlington, in Suffolk, England; where he was born in 1574. At fifteen years of age he was entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he spent nine years; and, with the iron diligence of the scholars of that day, made vast attainments in learning. Here he sat under the searching ministry of William Perkins, that great puritan luminary, who was the spiritual father of John Cotton, and of so many other most famous men of God. For several years, Mr. Blackerby labored under an inflamed and angry conscience, whose steady pains kept him on the verge of despondency. His drooping spirits resulted in pining health. His father, a man of good estate, ignorant of the cause of his

dejection, and hoping to benefit him by change of air and scene, took him home. But the balm was not adapted to the hurt, and it remained unhealed. It was not till he was riding alone over a heath, on his way back to College, that he found peace with God through faith in Christ. From that time, his peace was like a river, and flowed with unbroken stream to his dying day.

On leaving the University, Mr. Blackerby became chaplain in the household of Sir Thomas Jermyn, of Rushbrook, in Suffolk; and afterwards in that of Sir Edward Lukenor, of Denham, in the same county. Both of these knights were godly men, and staunch friends and supporters of the persecuted Puritans. Sir Edward was a member of several parliaments, and an eminent patriot. With him, Mr. Blackerby continued, till he married Sarah, the eldest daughter of Mr. Oldham, rector in the same town, with whom he resided two years. He was then called to preach at Feltwell, in Norfolk. Here he tarried for some time, till he was troubled for refusing to conform to the prelatical usurpations, and was forced to remove. The patient pilgrim next pitched his tent, in 1606, at Ashdon, where he abode for twenty-three years.

His employment, by which he supported his family, was the boarding and instruction of a large number of youth of good families, some of whom arose to eminence. One of them was Mr. Stone, afterwards the famous minister of Hartford, Connecticut. Mr. Blackerby "walked before his scholars, as a picture of Jesus among his disciples." His conscientious scruples against the superstitions retained in the established Church, prevented him from accepting any ecclesiastical preferment or pastoral charge; though he was constantly employed in preaching the gospel at various places. The places where he principally labored in this much loved work, were Castle Heveningham, Stoke, and Hundon. When silenced in one place, he fled to another; and his voice was seldom hushed for any long time together. "He was a mighty man in wounding consciences by the sword of the Spirit, and in healing them by the blood of Jesus." He reckoned above two thousand souls as the seals of his memory. He spake with a fervency which made one of three results almost inevitable,—his hearers must either fly to the truth, or fly from it, or fly out against it. Many exceedingly profane persons were converted under his ministry. At Castle Heveningham, there was a club of young people wholly given to dissipation; of whom nearly all were turned to

God, and became a company of gracious Christians, as much devoted to mutual prayer as they had been to sin and folly. Of those who bitterly opposed his ministry, and procured his suspension by the oppressive ecclesiastical courts, it was observed that they never prospered after ; but were usually blasted in property and character, and nearly all came to a miserable end. Thus when he was suspended from preaching at Hundon, one of his opposers was boasting in the church-yard of getting Blackerby out of the pulpit. A woman standing by retorted : " And Blackerby will preach in Hundon pulpit, when you are crying in hell ! " Whatever may be thought of this expression, it is remarkable, that the man was not long after buried ; and the very next Sabbath, Mr. Blackerby, his suspension having been taken off, thundered once more in the pulpit of Hundon.

His life was long and laborious. He was one of those who looked upon a " leisure hour " as a convenient time for doing something useful. He was an early riser, and spent the whole day either in praying, in learning, or in teaching. He was an indefatigable student, and especially of the Scriptures, having great skill in the original tongues, and a turn of mind assimilated to the spirit of the Holy Word by habits of high and constant devotion. His numerous pupils were daily and thoroughly trained in the duties of piety, as well as in liberal learning. Their teacher not only showed them the way wherein they should go, but exemplarily walked before them therein. Many graduates from the university repaired to him, as to a Gamaliel, to be further furnished for the ministry. These he instructed in Hebrew and interpretation, read them lectures in divinity, and taught them the duties of the pastoral care.

But his greatest study, and that wherein he was most successful, was personal piety. In family religion, he was exceedingly punctual and exact ; and was justly regarded by such as knew him best, as " one of the holiest men living." He might have the charge of infirmity, but never of iniquity, laid at his door. No idle or angry word was ever known to escape him. His whole life was that of a man who had God and the judgment ever in view. Of his own imperfections, however, he was deeply and most self-abasingly sensible : and while he bitterly accused himself, he judged most charitably of others. He often commended a saying of his spiritual father, the famous Mr. Perkins : " When

a man is once acquainted with his own heart, he will be apt to think every one better than himself."

He was a faithful friend and wise reprover; and suffered no sin to pass without rebuke. In this difficult duty, he manifested such a sweet and earnest spirit, that they whose consciences he touched to the quick, loved him all the better. His reproofs were compared to nails dipped in oil before they were driven; and received into the inmost heart with all acceptance, because of the overcoming kindness with which he urged them home. Mr. Blackerby once remonstrated privately, and in serious affection, with a distinguished man, of formidable temper, who had used profane language at table. The offender was melted by his benevolent manner, and owned his fault, adding the words: "Sir, had you reproved me at table, I would have stabbed you; but now I thank you." He would ever reprove sin, and yet without provoking further sin by the manner of his rebuke.

Like all the Puritans, Mr. Blackerby was a zealous observer of the Sabbath, "that Queen of days, and Pearl of the week." By way of preparation, he always preached in his own house to the family and neighbors, at four o'clock on the afternoon of Saturday. In this respect, he was a more commendable "Saturday-afternoon-man," than some other ministers who have been heard of! On the Sabbath, he rose earlier than on other days; and besides expounding the Scriptures, prayed six times with the family; praying often, but never long, namely, at morning and night, and at the threshold of his house on going to, and returning from, the morning and evening worship of the sanctuary. His piety was not restricted to holy time. He was one of those ministers of religion described by Wordsworth.

" Whose least distinguished day
Shines with some portion of that heavenly lustre,
Which makes the Sabbath lovely in the sight
Of blessed angels, pitying human cares."

Mr. Blackerby once preached at Linton, in Cambridgeshire, at an annual fair, which, from very ancient times, had been held on the Lord's day. The people were convinced by his persuasions, and that sinful custom was thenceforward laid aside.

Though a man whose affections were naturally ardent, yet his passions were so subdued to the rule of grace, that the loss of the

objects of his tenderest attachment could not perturb his mind, or hinder his enjoyment of God. At the funeral of his eldest daughter, whom he dearly loved, and of whom he believed that she had feared God from three years old, he preached with the greatest self-possession. He preached as one who had lost less in the removal of his dearest child, than he found in One incomparably more dear. A settled peace of conscience, and full assurance of faith, kept his mind in a holy and heavenly calm. Before his death, he frequently declared, that for forty years he had never had "a doubting thought of his salvation."

When the tyrannical sway of the prelates was swept away by order of parliament, in 1641, Mr. Blackerby, who had been residing about twelve years with a son-in-law, rector of Great Wratting, at last assumed the pastoral charge, at the age of sixty-seven! This was at Great Thurlow, in his native county of Suffolk. In that station he spent the residue of his days, a zealous laborer for the good of souls, and "painful preacher of God's word," to the very last. He was taken sick in the pulpit, and borne to his home. After six weeks of languishment, he "fell on sleep" at the age of seventy-four. This was in the year 1648.

There are many scattered testimonies to Mr. Blackerby's merits. One who knew him, says: "He was an excellent linguist, and accounted the best Hebræan in Cambridge:" and Granger, the biographical historian states, that "he was perfectly skilled in the learned languages." Many of the Puritans, who knew with what firm faith they had laid hold of God's covenant, were persuaded that they would have a pious posterity, and used habitually to pray for their descendants to the end of time. And Mr. Blackerby, on his death-bed, expressed strong hopes, that, in the day of judgment, there would be many hundreds of his offspring standing at the right hand of the Son of man. There is reason to believe that his seven children and their partners, and all *their* children, were heirs of eternal life. It is also known, that many of his great-grandchildren were eminent for piety and usefulness. This man had about him much of the patriarchal faith, and much of the patriarchal dignity. There was in his aspect a majestic gravity, and a bright impression of holiness, which inspired awe in such as approached him. The celebrated Daniel Rogers of Wethersfield, used to say, that he could never come into his presence without trembling. Though his name is

now quite forgotten, the good effects of his sanctity and self-denial still survive. When Fuller, Sutcliffe, Carey and Ryland met, on the twenty-first of January, 1788, to found the Baptist Missionary Society, and so gave that mighty impulse to the work of modern missions, they girded their minds by reading together the sketch of Blackerby's hallowed life, in Dr. Gillies's "Historical Collections."

Thus have we glanced at a man, who would have been deemed great for goodness, but for the multitude as great in the same respect, among whom he shines but as the star absorbed amid the collective orbs of its *nebula*. And who that has heard of the multitude of stars which, in their dim distance, are lost to the view of the unassisted eye, has not felt the longings, which only an immortal nature can feel, to visit and know them all? Such must be the feelings of the Christian as to the pious dead, whom no man can number, whose names, and distinct existence, and personal history, are lost from view; and whose light is blended in the faint clouds which are scattered over the long mid-night of the past. Hereafter we shall see those clouds resolved into their separate luminaries, each radiant with eternal glories, and shining forth like the sun in the kingdom of the Father.

DIFFICULTIES OF ORTHODOXY.

THE editor of this work has received an interesting letter of some length, from a person in a distant State. It is written by one who was educated in the orthodox belief; but whose inquiries have brought very distinctly to his view certain difficulties, which have painfully perplexed his mind, and strongly tempt him to embrace the Unitarian sentiments. The best remedy for such temptations is the prayerful study of the Bible, with a sincere delight in all that exalts the grace of God in our salvation.

We are persuaded that there are many, especially among the young, who are in the same state of mind with our correspondent. For their sakes, as well as his, we are happy to comply with his request, by fully stating his difficulties, and by appending such remarks as we feel to be sufficient for their removal. This we

proceed to do, very much as we would in a private letter penned for the same purpose.

1. Our friend begins with the most important of his questions. "If the doctrine of the Trinity be a Scriptural doctrine, why is it not, *in explicit terms*, more distinctly taught in the Bible?" In this connection, reference is made to the agonizing prayer of Dr. Watts, offered while his mind was agitated with a conflict of doubts on this same subject.

This question must have suggested itself to every reflecting mind, in reference to every point, which has been warmly and discordantly discussed in the Christian world. The question is often raised, why were they not revealed in terms so definite and precise, as to preclude debate? We might ask back again, How a system so delivered could conduce to the strength and activity of the believer's mind? Or, whether any spiritual truth can be so expressed in human language, as to defy the tamperings and distortions of the ignorant, the prejudiced, the interested, the guilty, or the excessively critical? But it is enough for the humble disciple of the Saviour, that the articles of his belief are evidently set forth in the Bible, in that manner which has seemed good to its divine Author.

As respects this particular doctrine, it is cheerfully conceded, that it is no where set down in the Bible in the exact forms used in catechisms and confessions of faith. And the satisfactory reason for this is, that it is never delivered as a merely speculative point, but altogether in a practical way. It occurs only in connection with the plan of salvation, and as indissolubly intertwined with the workings and actual results of that plan. Whoso wishes to see the practical grounds of the Trinitarian belief, let him, as an anxious and sincere inquirer after the mode of his own salvation, look at the doctrine of the Bible as to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. He will then see the Father, as a distinct divine person, creating, preserving, and graciously providing, in his own infinite love, for the salvation of the sinner. The Son will also be seen as a distinct divine person, to whom are expressly ascribed divine names, perfections, works and honors; and who became flesh, or assumed humanity, that he might redeem and save the lost. The Spirit, too, will be seen as a distinct divine person, to whom are ascribed personal acts of supreme dignity and grace, in the renewing of the soul by direct sanctifying power,

and abiding therein as an indwelling Comforter. Thus is the doctrine of a tri-personal Godhead fully developed in the *religious experience* of a thorough Christian; and this practical Trinitarianism is worth incalculably more than the most nice and scholastic belief of a speculative sort. No person who comes in this way to the knowledge of the truth, ever thinks of complaining that it is revealed in the Bible less plainly than it might be. In the agreement of the Bible with his own experience as a renewed and pardoned sinner, he obtains on this, and all other matters essential to his hope of salvation, the deepest convictions of the truth. It is because the doctrine of the Trinity rests on such strong practical ground in the Bible, that it has, in all ages of the Church, been so earnestly maintained as the grand distinctive feature of Christianity. Salvation is wrapped up in the revealed declaration of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; and thus comes to us in a form which fully satisfies the heart.

No sound Trinitarian holds this doctrine in any sense which, to his view, conflicts with the unity of God. "One only living and true God," is the prime element of his belief. Neither does he maintain, as he is slanderously asserted to do, that the three sacred persons of the Trinity are one in the same sense in which they are three; nor that the one God is three in the same respects in which he is one. This crude and gross arithmetical absurdity, is far from his thoughts: and they who ungenerously taunt him with it, only shew, as a distinguished senator of Massachusetts is said to have expressed himself, that they are "ignorant of the mathematics of heaven." It is true, that the nature of the personal distinction between the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, is mysterious; but all the consoling and sanctifying power of the doctrine can be as fully felt, as it could if there were no mystery in it. It is not necessary to solve the mystery of vegetative life by which an apple is formed, before a hungry man can feed upon it with the highest relish. The mysteriousness of the production of the manna in the wilderness, did not destroy its grateful and nutritious properties, as the heavenly food of the children of Israel.

The perplexity which tortured for a time the excellent Dr. Watts and others, did not arise from anything delivered in the Bible on the subject; but from the unsatisfactory comparisons, and metaphysical subtleties with which the divines, in their

attempts at explanation, had fogged and beclouded the matter-of-fact statements of the Bible, in regard to the doctrine of Father, Son and Spirit. Take this doctrine as Inspiration has left it, and it is revealed to us with all desirable plainness, and with all the plainness which is possible in the present condition of our minds.

2. Our correspondent's next difficulty is as follows: "How is it, that those passages in the New Testament which have been regarded as direct testimony to Trinitarianism, are, almost without an exception, under suspicion; and some of them are even proved to be, in whole or in part, spurious or interpolated? I refer especially to 1 Tim. iii. 16, 1 John, v. 7, Acts, xx. 28. I learn from Wilson's list of Trinitarian concessions, that a number of what have been regarded as proof-texts are given up, even by those who still retain the system, though they have laid aside these particular weapons of defence heretofore employed in its behalf."

Now to our mind, these points afford strong presumptions in favor of orthodoxy. What other system, professing to be based upon the Bible, has such an amplitude of proofs, that it can afford to forbear the use of a considerable number of them, without materially weakening its defence? And did it never occur to our friend, that tampering with the received text is the last resort of desperate criticism; which, failing in every attempt to untie the fast knots, is forced to slash them asunder with the knife? Where is the instance in which orthodox critics have been compelled to save their belief by conjectural emendations of the "original Hebrew and Greek of the Holy Ghost?" They are not driven to such harsh and perilous expedients. They by far prefer to receive the Bible as it is. And how do their assailants appear, thus reduced to the inglorious necessity of filing away at the letter of the text; only too happy to find the smallest possible crack through which they may make a "narrow escape?" It is curious to see how easily they are satisfied in this respect; two or three manuscripts in their favor are enough to outweigh hundreds against them. Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament is still hugged by the Unitarian divines, although it abounds in reckless and unauthorized changes of the text, whereby all confidence in its integrity is shaken, and the trumpet is made to give an uncertain sound. Since his day, hundreds of manuscript copies, unknown to him, have been examined and compared.

And the result has been, in a vast majority of cases, the restoration of readings which he had spotted as suspicious, or expunged as spurious.

Thus as to the first passage especially referred to by our correspondent, — “*God* was manifest in the flesh,” — out of the mass of Greek manuscripts which are still extant, only three or four, and those of inferior authority, are in favor of Griesbach’s alteration to “*who* was manifest in the flesh.” And though most of the translations are in favor of the change, they cannot be weighed against nearly the whole of the manuscripts, and the great body of the Greek Fathers who quote the passage. But even if so changed, the only regular antecedent to the personal pronoun “*who*,” is the “*living God*” in the preceding verse; so that the deity of Christ is equally taught in either way.

At the risk of irritating our Unitarian friends, who cannot endure that any one should doubt the spuriousness of the “*three witnesses*” in 1 John, v. 7, we deny that it is yet a decided case. We are aware that there is a great mass of testimony against the genuineness of the passage; and yet, so great is the amount of evidence in its favor, that it has been warmly defended by many scholars of the very highest rank. Among these, we will merely refer to the writings of the truly learned bishop Burgess, addressed to Miss Joanna Baillie. Before the question can be fully decided, we must have further evidence, either on one side or the other. Meanwhile, we will cheerfully forbear advancing this passage in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. However we may value it for the purposes of private edification, we are entirely willing to dispense with its use in a controversy in which truth is abundantly evidenced without its aid, by a host of passages of undisputed genuineness. This passage, doubtful as the matter is left, is by far the strongest case of interpolation which the Unitarians have been able to make out.

In the remaining case named by our correspondent, “*the church of God*,” in Acts xx. 28, we have only room to remark that the received reading is far better supported than any other; and that it is even preferred by the zealous Socinian, Wakefield, who, to evade its doctrinal bearing, resorts to a very singular interpretation of the word “*blood*” in the succeeding clause.

We must make a remark upon the principle of Wilson’s huge book of “*Trinitarian concessions*.” Let it first be considered how

vast is the multitude of orthodox divines, and of their works. Then let it be considered how great is the range for diversity of opinion, within certain very wide and yet definite bounds, among these writers. The name "orthodox" comprehends as well Baxter, almost an Arminian, as Crisp, almost an Antinomian. Now is it any argument against those main points of orthodoxy in which all these legions, with their innumerable differences as to temper and education, are perfectly agreed, that they vary much among themselves as to the bearing of particular passages, some highly esteeming as proofs what others disregard? On Wilson's plan of investigation, it will be impossible to regard the plainest point of doctrine or duty as provable from the Bible; because there is no text which some one has not understood differently from almost every body else. Let us suppose, for example, that there is some definite number of texts, say one hundred, which are quoted in proof of the immortality of the soul. Some sceptic roams through the vast forest of orthodox literature, till he has picked up a fagot of a hundred crooked sticks, each of which has struck at a different text in the list. Then hear him argue thus: "The Bible teaches us no such doctrine as immortality, for every one of the five-score proof-texts has been *conceded* by some body, who, notwithstanding, believed the doctrine; and would not have given up a text, if he could have avoided it! Therefore that dogma is *conceded* by the orthodox themselves!" Who would not laugh at such laborious trifling as this? Yet this is the amount of poor Mr. Wilson's big volume, pirated and garbled, as it has been, by his American brethren. It is nothing but a tedious quibble on an immense scale. Never did we so pity an unfortunate man for hard labor spent in vain. What he has chiefly proved, is the excessive *candor* of Trinitarian divines.

3. Our friend presents another question for consideration. "Is it honest for enlightened ministers, who must know the state in which such texts now lie, still to use them, as some evidently do, not only as proof-texts to be embodied in a discourse, but as foundations on which to erect their discourses?"

To this we answer, that if any minister, speaking in the name of the Lord, should dare to present passages as authentic which he knows, or strongly suspects, to be spurious, he would be guilty of detestable perfidy. If our friend knows of any "enlightened ministers" who "evidently" commit such an outrage against in-

tegrity and sincerity, let him rebuke them with honest indignation ; as we also would do, if we knew of any such instances. Only let it be *ascertained*, that the minister who adduces a disputed passage is not himself persuaded that it is genuine. Where, amid conflicting testimony, there is so much room for honest differences of opinion, we must be careful on our part not to be guilty of rash and uncharitable judgment.

4. Our friend proceeds to ask : “ Why do Trinitarians decline fair and honorable challenges made by Unitarians, to test their respective systems ? ”

To this we would say, that, in this part of the country, where the Unitarians have more influence than elsewhere, and where the controversy is rifest, the Trinitarians decline no such challenges. No Anti-trinitarian work of any consequence has, so far as we know, been published here, but what it has instantly been seized upon for confutation : while several important publications on the Trinitarian side have never, to our knowledge, been reviewed by the Unitarians. These latter are not apt to complain of being let alone by their orthodox neighbors ; but, on the contrary, they try to excite prejudice against us, as being too eager for controversial strife, and unwilling to let them alone. As for the case of Dr. Miller, of Princeton, alluded to by our correspondent, we know of no reason, why he should shrink from any proposal on the part of Dr. Sparks, “ to test their contending views by an appeal to the moral effects of each respectively.” There are many objects of benevolence vigorously sustained among the Orthodox, in which the Unitarians attempt little or nothing. And, with perhaps one exception, there is no good work in which the Orthodox have not preceded them, and often gone far beyond them. The generous efforts of the Unitarians in behalf of the poor of our cities, for which we rejoice to give them hearty commendation, will hardly compensate in the long run for the tendency of their principles to shake the confidence of the young in the claims of Christianity. That truly amiable man, Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, a learned and zealous Socinian tutor, used to express his surprise, “ how it happened that most of his pupils turned Deists.”* Dr. Priestley made no secret of his inclinations in the same direction. Blanco White went on to condemn the Bible and much of its morality,

* Wilson's History of Dissenting Churches, &c. Vol. i. P. 105.

and to give up his belief in a future life. In this country, the "moral effects" of Unitarianism are prominently seen, in what Doctors Norton and Ware did not hesitate to call the "latest form of infidelity." It is well known that a very large proportion, if not the whole, of the disciples of Mr. Parker and his school, have become gross and open unbelievers. In them, as is often said, we see Unitarianism "gone to seed."

5. The remarks just made will meet, in part, the next query of our correspondent: "Why are Trinitarians so much in the habit of charging infidelity on the system of their opponents, when the ablest defences of the outworks of our religion are from the pens of such writers as Lardner, Grotius, and others?"

We think that this complaint would not be made against the Orthodox, if they were properly understood. Few of them, if any, would say that a Unitarian is an absolute infidel. We do not hesitate to say that Unitarianism, as a system of objective doctrines, — an outward system of written sentiments, — is not true Christianity. But this is not saying, that the Unitarian himself is certainly no Christian. Even when he has "made shipwreck of the faith," he may possibly, by clinging to some single plank, come safe to shore, though it be through frightful peril. It is not for man to judge what is the very minimum of saving truth, what is the smallest fragment of gospel belief, which may suffice to keep a soul from perdition. But we will warn our fellow-voyagers to eternity against trusting to an experiment which, to all who try it, must be dangerous in the extreme, and to many must be fatal.

What we allege against Unitarianism is, not that it is outright infidelity, or even that its advocates are conscious of being influenced by an unbelieving spirit; but that it manifestly *tends* to infidelity; and if left to its natural course, and followed out in its logical consequences, must *end* there. Its road lies in that direction, though it is certain that the greater part of the travellers stop short, and would abhor the thought of finishing the journey. We are justified in ascribing this tendency to abstract Unitarianism by weighty reasons. In the first place, it rejects the plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures; and thus at the outset, makes an alarming movement toward forsaking the citadel, for which dereliction all their labors in "defending the outworks of our religion" can make no tolerable compensation. In the next place, if the rejection of all the essential features of Christianity is complete infi-

delity, then the rejection of more or less of them is partial infidelity, and is not the fruit of faith, but of unbelief. In the last place, experience amply proves, that this partial infidelity is apt to increase its range, the abandonment of one truth almost necessitating the abandonment of the next, till link after link of the golden chain is broken.

6. Our correspondent's next inquiry relates to the alleged disposition of the Trinitarians to "suppress inquiry on the subject of theological differences."

If this means, that they are pained when they see those who were religiously educated manifesting a disposition to exchange truth for error; and that they use arguments, and entreaties, and even warnings, to prevent such a disastrous change, we see not that there is anything wrong in this. Nor does "such conduct indicate a secret want of becoming confidence in the grounds of their own system." The orthodox have a full belief in the depravity of the human heart. They know that error is more congenial than truth to that depravity; and, therefore, they would be sinning against their convictions, and against the souls of their fellow men, if they did not resist that corrupt propensity to error, by appealing to reason, to conscience, and to all the natural susceptibilities of the soul. This is the dictate of benevolence, and has no savor of bigotry, cowardice, or narrowness of mind. They would gladly have all men inquire in all directions, and to any extent, for truth; but they are religiously anxious that these investigations should result aright. To make the current of liberal research a blessing, it should have banks as well as streams. Let something be pardoned to a pure and generous motive, if, at any time, it is betrayed into excess at the sight of a soul in danger of being perverted and misled. So far as we have known them, enlightened Trinitarians take a deep and peculiar pleasure in looking into the grounds of their own belief; and few things can gratify them more than to have others examine into those grounds, when they do it, not to carp, or cavil, or blaspheme, but to see whether or not they are firm and immovable. Such investigation they have ever invited and encouraged.

7. Our correspondent's next inquiry is of the same general character with the preceding question, but has special reference to the manner in which Professor Stuart has treated Mrs. Dana for dealing in what is not "lady's work." As our friend speaks of being

“so pleased with the candid, rational, kind and Christian manner and spirit” in which we have discussed that lady’s widely circulated book, we hope that this may be accepted as a sufficient expression of our opinion, as to the proper mode of proceeding in such a case. We hold that it is not merely the privilege, but the bounden duty, of all females to read the Word of God, and to inquire into its meaning; for, as Chillingworth says, the “*meaning* of the Bible is the Bible.” And if they have anything on the subject worthy of being given to the world, this is their unquestionable right. There seem to be good reasons why they should be numbered with the non-combatants; but if they think proper to plunge into the strifes of the fighting men, they ought not to think it hard if they should be treated according to the general rules for the treatment of fighting men. For ourselves, we frankly confess that we had rather run a tilt against Goliath of Gath, than against a romantic and accomplished Armida, whom we are required to throw from her horse without inflicting a bruise, or breaking a bone.

8. The last question propounded by our friend, which we have room to notice, is the following: “Why do Trinitarians so commonly and confidently affirm that, however good a system Unitarianism may prove to live by, it cannot sustain the ordeal of death? when there seems to be an abundance of testimony, that Unitarians can die in as much peace, and with as comfortable a hope, as those who make such allegations.” Under this query, allusion is made to some individual cases.

Here we must first set our friend right, by remarking, that Trinitarians do *not* commonly and confidently affirm, that Unitarianism is a good system to live by. They think quite the contrary. Not but that many Unitarians live virtuously and exemplarily in all their deportment. We think that popery is a very bad system to live by; though there be many papists of excellent behavior. We think that infidelity is even worse to live by than popery; and yet there have been arrant infidels, like Charles Lamb, who have been amiable and honorable in their deportment; and have died, too, apparently in peace and composure, and without distractions or terrors. No one can tell how much of this may be owing to the exhausting effects of pain and weakness, how much to the stupefying power of disease and medicine, how much to deep delusions of a sincere mind, or how much to judicial blindness and abandonment to hardness of heart.

We regard the death-bed as a better detector of error than discoverer of truth ; though it often fails in both respects. For Unitarians ; at the approach of death to renounce their sentiments, is no unusual thing, as we ourselves have repeatedly witnessed. But for a devout Trinitarian to abjure his belief with expiring breath, is a thing we never knew nor heard of. These matters are worth looking at, and may help to confirm a resolution already formed, or to settle an opinion previously entertained. But it were as absurd to rest our religious belief on such experiments, as to decide it by the ordeal of battle or the casting of lots.

Our friend proposes two other inquiries of a nature too discursive to be treated here. One relates to the mutual imputation of bad motives to each other, by the contending parties ; and in respect to this we are as willing as he, that blame should fall where it belongs. The other question seems to turn on some peculiarities of the Presbyterian Church, which we have no disposition to defend, and which cannot affect the abstract truth of the Trinitarian system of doctrine. In the best actions of the holiest men, if we knew all, there would ever be something to condemn.

We close by saying to our intelligent friend, and to every other reader who may have been troubled in mind by the same or similar difficulties, Go on, courageously and honestly seeking to find the truth, and feel its force. First of all, let it be fully decided in your own mind, whether or not the Bible is the Word of God, in such sort that its collected testimony, on any point whereon it speaks, must be conclusive as the divine witness of Him who is truth itself. If you decide against this, its supreme authority and arbitrement, we have no further advice to offer, as we can expect no good to result where the Bible is treated with any inferior consideration. But if you feel that you can take counsel at this oracle of God as at the mouth of the Lord himself, then bow implicitly to its teachings, as embodying his own wisdom and excellence. Use independently the powers of your mind, and the best helps within your reach, in all readiness to be taught of God, and with constant prayer for the illumination and guidance of the Holy Spirit. We have no fears, while you pursue this Christian course, as to the result in respect to your orthodoxy, and bid you a cheerful Godspeed on your way. Hoping to do the same ourselves, and to meet you in a better world, we bid you a fraternal farewell.

OBSERVATIONS ON MEN, BOOKS, AND THINGS.

PRESIDENT HOPKINS'S ESSAYS AND DISCOURSES. — This is a noble volume from the highly reputed press of T. R. Marvin. And nobly is it replenished with the miscellaneous writings of the accomplished head of Williams College. It is in this form, of essays for important periodicals, and of occasional discourses delivered before literary audiences, that the scholars of our day produce their most elaborate and successful efforts. In these before us, we find reading which instructs and interests in no ordinary degree, and gives us the strong effusions of a truly original mind, without shocking the sense of truth and propriety. We have a class of would-be-geniuses, whose critical scepticism will not allow that any truth has ever been demonstrated, and whose delight is to startle the public with strange and unthought of theories. They are like the rough practical joker, who sets up for a wit among his comrades, on the strength of the slyness with which he can come up with an unsuspecting victim, and give him a slap on the back that shall make him spring six inches from the floor. Just so with our new Germanic geniuses. They call it promoting mental activity, if they can unsettle all settled ideas, and leave everything confusedly afloat. If they can give a poor reader "an ugly turn," and by a sudden surprise force him into a frightened jump, though he come down even where he was before, — this is boasted of as if they had occasioned a great stride in the march of mind. Dr. Hopkins reminds us very strongly of this class of scribblers; but it is by the wide contrast between their fruitless innovations, and the instructive and eloquent manner in which he gives to old and familiar subjects, the interest of novelty, as well as of established truth. We say no more; for, in expressing our sense of his signal merits, we seem rather to be commending ourselves than him.

DR. CHALMERS. — In this great man, we see of what high account the humble office of the gospel ministry may become. He has not left the world without "leaving his mark" upon the age, so broad and distinct, that it shall be visible as long as the age itself shall remain in the sight of posterity. Few deaths have called forth so many and strong expressions of veneration, as have been uttered from his own, and from foreign lands. Among others, we have read with high satisfaction, "A Discourse on the Life and Character" of the illustrious Scotch divine, by Professor Edwards of Andover. It is fitting that our oldest theological seminary should lay garlands of this sort on the tomb of the most renowned theologian of our day; and it is to be hoped that other seminaries for instruction in what Bacon called the queen of sciences, will in some such manner declare their sense of his merits. To pay proper homage to such minds, is the way to keep them from becoming extinct. Nor let it be thought, that, in commending the instruments by whom God carries on his work, we shall detract at all from the honor of his sovereign grace. To praise the edge of the axe, is no disparagement to the strength or skill with which it is wielded. As the excellent John Norton said, in 1659: "That God maketh use of man, is not from his need of him, but his favor to him; not from defect of power, but abundance of goodness."

THE ALLEGED SUPPRESSION OF DR. BUSHNELL'S BOOK. — For giving to this book their official sanction, the Publishing Committee of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society have been blamed enough and for their subsequent disposal of it, much more than enough. A great cry is raised of "suppression." The changes are rung upon this ill-favored word, as though some outrage had been committed upon mental and religious liberty. So much odium has thus been cast upon the orthodox community, that we feel bound to state the facts as they are. The affairs of the Society are conducted by a Board of Managers annually chosen. The business is distributed by this Board to several committees of its members, who statedly report their doings to the whole Board, for revisal and approbation. To a Publishing Committee is assigned all that relates to the examination and approval of books issued under the auspices of the Society. The treatise on "Christian Nurture" was subjected to a rigid revision. When it first came into the hands of the Committee, it was so much more objectionable than it is now, that they could not consent to its publication. It passed from one to another, and once and again went back to the author for important alterations; till, as he sarcastically reminds them in his "Argument," the very paper was well nigh worn out. It was, at last, so far modified, and purged of its more objectionable features, that to the majority of the Committee, it seemed, compared with what it was originally, to be cleared of all that was not capable of a good construction. They did not suppose themselves to be held accountable for the absolute perfection of any book belonging to their catalogue, but only that it shall be in general correct, and adapted to do good. Besides, the responsibility seemed to rest mostly with the author whose name it bore on the title page, who is a clergyman of full standing in the Orthodox State of Connecticut; and whose work was requested for the press, as it is said, by one of the most respectable Associations in New England. The Committee looked not so much at the blemishes of the book, as at many important truths in it, which were expressed with great force and beauty. Still they erred greatly, though not unpardonably, in consenting to its publication by their Society, whose orthodoxy has ever been high and unimpeachable. It soon became evident, that the book contained much that was very offensive to the greater part of the orthodox community; and more so, perhaps, to the laity than to the ministry. Upon this, the Committee, who act as a sort of trustees for that community, took up the matter again, as they were bound to do. They directed that the sales should be so far *suspended*, that it should not be used as a library book, in filling out discretionary orders; though still furnished at private sale, when expressly called for. This partial suspension was for the purpose of reconsidering the book, with a view to making some satisfactory arrangement. A meeting of the Board of Managers was soon after held, at which these proceedings were sanctioned; except, that the suspension was so extended, that no more copies were to be done up for sale, till the matter should be finally adjusted. There is not a member, either of the Committee or of the Board, who wishes to place the slightest obstacle in the way of liberty of thought, or the freedom of the press. But, as men entrusted with the interests of a public

religious Charity, they cannot, with any propriety, continue to give the seal of their *official* approbation to a book, while it contains passages which though taken by them in a good sense, are found to be liable to dangerous constructions. It will be matter of just rejoicing, if the excitement on this occasion, shall cause the whole subject of religious education to be more carefully studied, better understood, and more happily reduced to practice.

FANCY BALLS. — This mode of indulging the propensity for promiscuous dancing, is among the most hurtful and demoralizing. Individuals disguise themselves in the costumes of different nations, or of various historical or fabulous personages, often giving the preference to such savage or fantastic garbs as require an indecorous exposure of the person. Our whole knowledge of these ridiculous and immodest spectacles, is derived from the descriptions of "letter-writers" in the public prints. But from these descriptions, though written by admirers and lauders of such doings, it is plain that fancy balls, as all masquerades have notoriously done, must administer to corruption and vice. Various arts are used to help out these gross exhibitions. Besides the usual set of acting managers, there is another, composed of distinguished and dignified gentlemen, whose names, presence and countenance, are to give character and respectability to the scandalous scene. Those elderly gentlemen of wealth and standing ought to be aware, that no founding of libraries, or endowing of colleges, or other tokens of spirited regard to the public good, can atone for the injury thus done to sound morals and youthful purity. Another expedient is, to charge a high price for the admission of gentlemen and ladies, who retain enough of self-respect to go decently dressed; while such as are willing to display their lack of brains and abundance of brass, by fantastic apparel, and by the exposure of much of that natural texture, which Coleridge calls their "birth-day suit," are admitted on the cheapest terms. It is strange, that the public sentiment of New England, far as it now is from being "outrageously virtuous," has not rebuked and prohibited a custom, which, if it become general among us, must rapidly degrade us to Parisian looseness, and Italian debauchery.

THE RIVAL GRAMMARS. — "The quarrels of authors" have been pleasantly related by D'Israeli; and the inky "battle of the books," may afford some relief to minds disgusted with the atrocities of bloody wars such as they wage in Mexico. In the existing conflict among the Hebrew Grammars, our readers may like to be informed as to its origin and course. Our puritan fathers were enthusiastic scholars of that ancient tongue in which Inspiration first spake; but in later times, it had become quite neglected, or very unskilfully taught, till Hebrew literature was revived under the labors of Professor Stuart of Andover. His industry and enthusiasm have been felt for more than thirty years in this important department of sacred learning. His grammar of the language has passed through six editions, each of which has received such improvement, that they have seemed

like successive dispensations, where the last was ever brighter and clearer than what had gone before. In 1839, Professor Conant, of Hamilton, N. Y., published a translation from the German of the *eleventh* edition of Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar. The work appeared to be creditably done, except that he makes no allusion to the name of Professor Stuart, even when he is recounting the merits of other laborers in the same field. Meanwhile Gesenius dies, and a *fourteenth* edition of his work, with numerous and important modifications by himself, and by his no less able editor, Rödiger, appeared. Professor Stuart, finding that the last edition of his own Grammar was sold out, and that Professor Conant was not intending to make any use of the improvements in Rödiger's edition, concluded, instead of republishing his own book, to issue a translation of this later work. By this time, Professor Conant, who, no doubt, would be glad to have the veteran at Andover forgotten, found it necessary to take *some* notice of him. This was done in a large and very sour pamphlet, whose chief ingredient was a collection of numerous mistakes alleged to be found in Professor Stuart's translation, exhibiting him as a mere sciolist both in Hebrew and German. The odor of this pamphlet was a little *too* strong; and, of course, it was not supposable, that the insulted father of Hebrew studies among us, should honor it with his notice. In the North American Review for July, however, there appeared a "critical notice" of the affair, in which a very high tribute of respect is paid to Professor Stuart, while it is intimated, that Professor Conant has the advantage in the present controversy, and his criticisms are endorsed by the reviewer. Professor Stuart, having thus found "a foeman worthy of his steel," has now printed "A Letter to the Editor of the North American Review," in which he "turns the battle to the gate," and carries the war into the territories of his adversary, laying them utterly waste. This "Letter" evinces indirectly, what everybody knew, that the ripe scholar who wrote it, is thoroughly conversant with the niceties both of Hebrew and German speech. It is replete with most caustic wit, and will occasion among literary readers some mirth at poor Mr. Conant's expense. Suffice it to say, that the latter gentleman fares somewhat as the Hon. Mr. Marshall did, when, a few years since, he undertook the impeachment of the venerable John Quincy Adams! Mr. Stuart opens the boasted translation of Mr. Conant at random; and on *two* pages, deciding by that gentleman's own rules of criticism, detects, exposes and enumerates, not less than *sixty-five* mistakes and improper renderings! If this is an average, the whole book must contain many thousands of errors. If, after this, — and it is but one circumstance, — the publisher of "stereotyped" Hebrew Grammars, can make any tolerable defence of himself, he will be entitled to bear the motto of that Dr. John Conant, whom Richard Cromwell made vice-chancellor of Oxford University, in the place of Dr. John Owen: — "Conanti nihil impossibile." His better course will be to devote himself to those laborious studies, which if continued for some thirty years to come, may make him fit to be named in the same day with the illustrious divine he has so enviously traduced.